

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-26 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 9 and 22 are the independent claims. Claims 1-26 stand rejected. Applicants herein amend claims 1, 9, and 22. No new matter is added.

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102***

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over McConnell et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,993,475 (“McConnell”). Applicants have amended claim 1, and submit that McConnell fails to teach or suggest at least “a program module configured to parse a grammatical structure of the received inputs to identify a token not present in the received inputs, wherein the token includes a word that is statistically associated with documents that have a similar grammatical structure of the received inputs; a process configured to add the token to the received inputs thereby generating a modified inputs. Since McConnell fails to teach or suggest at least the above referenced portion of claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration to the rejection of claim 1.

Insomuch as claims 2 – 8 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 they too patentably define over McConnell. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration to the rejections of claims 2 – 8.

Independent claim 9 recites similar elements to that of claim 1 and patentably defined over McConnell for at least similar reasons with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection to claim 9.

Insomuch as claims 10 – 21 depend directly or indirectly from claim 9 they too patentably define over McConnell. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections to claims 10 – 21.

Independent claim 22 recites similar elements to that of claim 1 and patentably defined over McConnell for at least similar reasons with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection to claim 22.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-3513/302456.01  
**Application No.:** 10/822,499  
**Office Action Dated:** June 5, 2007

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

Insomuch as claims 23 – 26 depend directly or indirectly from claim 22 they too patentably define over McConnell. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections to claims 23 – 26.

### **CONCLUSION**

In the view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative.

Date: September 5, 2007

/David M. Platz/  
David M. Platz  
Registration No. 60,013

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439